**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3028/307006.01 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/776,371

Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

## REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending with claims 1, 15 and 29 being the independent claims. Claims 1-42 currently stand rejected.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 15-16, 18-20, 22, 29-30, 32-34 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <u>Rosenberg</u> ('Bringing Java to the Enterprise: Oracle on Its Java Server Strategy', Dave Rosenberg, IEEE Internet Computing, March-April 1998). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 15-16, 18-20, 22, 29-30, 32-34 and 36 are patentable for the reasons set forth below.

As amended, claims 1, 15 and 29 have been amended to recite that the "common language runtime can manage the execution of code written in a plurality of programming languages." Rosenberg recites only that a common language runtime can manage the execution of code written in a single programming language – Java. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that Rosenberg fails to recite all of the limitations of claims 1, 15 and 29 as amended, and respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4-6 and 8 depend from claim 1 and include every limitation of claim 1. Among other reasons, because claim 1 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4-6 and 8 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 16, 18-20 and 22 depend from claim 1 and include every limitation of claim 1. Among other reasons, because claim 1 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 16, 18-20 and 22 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 30, 32-34 and 36 depend from claim 1 and include every limitation of claim 1. Among other reasons, because claim 1 has been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 30, 32-34 and 36 are patentably defined over the prior art.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3028/307006.01 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/776,371

Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 3, 17 and 31 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Bugnion et al. (Patent Number 6,944,699). Claims 3, 17, and 31 depend from claims 1, 15 and 29, respectively and include every limitation of the respective claim. Among other reasons, because claims 1, 15 and 29 have been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 17 and 31 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 7, 21 and 35 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Lucovsky et al. (Patent Number 6,233,207). Claims 7, 21 and 35 depend from claims 1, 15 and 29, respectively and include every limitation of the respective claim. Among other reasons, because claims 1, 15 and 29 have been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 7, 21 and 35 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 9-10, 23-24 and 37-38 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Kumar et al. (Patent Number 6,697,810). Claims 9-10, 23-24 and 37-38 depend from claims 1, 15 and 29, respectively and include every limitation of the respective claim. Among other reasons, because claims 1, 15 and 29 have been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-10, 23-24 and 37-38 are patentably defined over the prior art.

Claims 11-14, 25-28 and 39-42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Ng (Publication Number 2004/0225893). Claims 11-14, 25-28 and 39-42 depend from claims 1, 15 and 29, respectively and include every limitation of the respective claim. Among other reasons, because claims 1, 15 and 29 have been patentably defined over the prior art, applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-14, 25-28 and 39-42 are patentably defined over the prior art.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3028/307006.01 **PATENT** 

**Application No.:** 10/776,371

Office Action Dated: August 22, 2007

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the above identified application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Date: December 3, 2007

/Peter Trahms-Neudorfer/ Peter Trahms-Neudorfer Registration No. 59,282

Woodcock Washburn LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891 Telephone: (215) 568-3100

Facsimile: (215) 568-3439